

Spin-wave interactions in quantum antiferromagnets

NILS HASSELMANN and PETER KOPIETZ

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Frankfurt, Max-von-Laue Strasse 1,
D-60438 Frankfurt, Germany*

PACS. 75.10.Jm – Quantized spin models.

PACS. 75.30.Ds – Spin waves.

Abstract. – We study spin-wave interactions in quantum antiferromagnets by expressing the usual magnon annihilation and creation operators in terms of Hermitian field operators representing transverse staggered and ferromagnetic spin fluctuations. In this parameterization, which was anticipated by Anderson in 1952, the two-body interaction vertex between staggered spin fluctuations vanishes at long wavelengths. We derive a new effective action for the staggered fluctuations only by tracing out the ferromagnetic fluctuations. To one loop order, the renormalization group flow agrees with the nonlinear- σ -model approach.

The spin-wave approach to quantum Heisenberg antiferromagnets, which was pioneered by Anderson [1] and Kubo [2] more than half a century ago, is still one of the most powerful methods to calculate the low-temperature properties of ordered magnets. In this approach, the components of the quantum-mechanical spin-operators $\mathbf{S}_i$ are expressed in terms of canonical boson operators b_i using the Holstein-Primakoff [3] or the Dyson-Maleev [4] transformation. The spin- S antiferromagnetic Heisenberg Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ij} J_{ij} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j, \quad (1)$$

can then be written as a bosonic many-body Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = -DNJS^2 + \hat{H}_2 + \hat{H}_{\text{int}}$, where the quadratic part is

$$\hat{H}_2 = S \sum_{ij} J_{ij} [b_i^\dagger b_i + b_j^\dagger b_j + b_i b_j + b_i^\dagger b_j^\dagger]. \quad (2)$$

The spins are assumed here to be localized at the sites $\mathbf{r}_i$ of a D -dimensional hypercubic lattice with lattice spacing a . The lattice is bipartite, with sublattices labelled A and B . We also assume $J_{ij} = J > 0$ for all pairs of nearest neighbors and $J_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.

The interaction $\hat{H}_{\text{int}}$ involves at least four boson operators and higher powers of the small parameter $1/S$, so that for large S it is reasonable to treat $\hat{H}_{\text{int}}$ perturbatively. However, as we discuss in more detail below, in momentum space the vertices of $\hat{H}_{\text{int}}$ have a complicated non-analytic structure for small momenta [5–7], so that the expected suppression of the interaction between long-wavelength Goldstone modes [8] is not manifest in this approach. On the other hand, in the calculation of physical quantities that are dominated by staggered spin-fluctuations the leading momentum-dependence of the vertices eventually cancels [9].

Note that the $1/S$ -expansion for quantum ferromagnets is not plagued by this problem: in this case the two-body interaction between ferromagnetic magnons vanishes quadratically for small momenta, reflecting the suppression of the effective interaction between long-wavelength Goldstone-modes [10].

Alternatively, we may work with the nonlinear sigma model (NLSM), which is believed to describe the long-wavelength and low-energy physics of quantum Heisenberg antiferromagnets in the so-called renormalized classical regime [11] (for a careful discussion and a derivation of an effective model for the short wavelength regime see [12]). In imaginary time τ and at finite temperature $T = 1/\beta$ the action of the NLSM is

$$S_{\text{NLSM}}[\mathbf{\Omega}] = \frac{\rho_0}{2} \int_0^\beta d\tau \int d^D r \left[(\partial_\mu \mathbf{\Omega})^2 + c_0^{-2} (\partial_\tau \mathbf{\Omega})^2 \right], \quad (3)$$

where the unit vector $\mathbf{\Omega}(\mathbf{r}, \tau)$ represents the slowly fluctuating staggered magnetization, ρ_0 and c_0 are the spin stiffness and the spin-wave velocity at $T = 0$. Assuming local staggered order in z -direction, we may resolve the constraint $\mathbf{\Omega}^2 = 1$ by writing the z -component of $\mathbf{\Omega}$ as $\sqrt{1 - \mathbf{\Pi}^2} \approx 1 - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{\Pi}^2 + \dots$, where the two-component vector $\mathbf{\Pi}$ represents the transverse staggered spin fluctuations. The interaction vertices generated in Eq. (3) by expanding the square root involve two derivatives, so that their Fourier transform vanishes quadratically for small wave-vectors or frequencies, in contrast to the vertices in the usual $1/S$ -expansion [5, 6].

Whether it is possible to parameterize the $1/S$ -expansion such that the weakness of the interaction between long-wavelength staggered spin fluctuations is manifest is a long-standing unsolved problem in spin-wave theory, which we shall solve in this work. Let us therefore recall the usual diagonalization procedure of the quadratic spin-wave Hamiltonian (2). First of all, we introduce the Fourier components of the operators b_i in the sublattice basis, defining $b_i = (2/N)^{1/2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i} A_{\mathbf{k}}$ if $\mathbf{r}_i$ belongs to sublattice A, and $b_i = (2/N)^{1/2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} e^{i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}_i} B_{\mathbf{k}}$ if $\mathbf{r}_i$ belongs to sublattice B. Here and below the $\mathbf{k}$ -sums are over the reduced Brillouin zone. The complete diagonalization of $\hat{H}_2$ is then achieved with the help of a Bogoliubov transformation,

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_{\mathbf{k}} \\ B_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_{\mathbf{k}} & -v_{\mathbf{k}} \\ -v_{\mathbf{k}} & u_{\mathbf{k}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \\ \beta_{-\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where $u_{\mathbf{k}} = 2^{-1/2} [\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{-1} + 1]^{1/2}$ and $v_{\mathbf{k}} = 2^{-1/2} [\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}^{-1} - 1]^{1/2}$ with $\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}} = [1 - \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}^2]^{1/2}$. Here $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}} = D^{-1} \sum_{\mu} \cos(k_{\mu} a)$, where $k_{\mu} = \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{\mu} \cdot \mathbf{k}$ are the components of $\mathbf{k}$ in the direction of the unit vectors $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_{\mu}$, $\mu = 1, \dots, D$. Then we obtain $\hat{H}_2 = -NDJS + \hat{H}'_2$, where

$$\hat{H}'_2 = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} E_{\mathbf{k}} [\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} + \beta_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \beta_{\mathbf{k}} + 1], \quad (5)$$

with the magnon dispersion $E_{\mathbf{k}} = 2DJS\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$. The Bogoliubov transformation (4) is not unique: any rotation that mixes the operators $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}$ will also diagonalize $\hat{H}_2$. To make contact with the $\mathbf{\Pi}$ -field in the NLSM, we choose $\hat{\Psi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} = 2^{-1/2} (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}} + \sigma \beta_{\mathbf{k}})$, where $\sigma = \pm$ labels the symmetric and antisymmetric combinations. We then express the magnon annihilation operators $\hat{\Psi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ in terms of two Hermitian field operators $\hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ and $\hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ as follows,

$$\hat{\Psi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} = p_{\sigma} (\chi_0 / 2V E_{\mathbf{k}})^{1/2} [E_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} + i\chi_0^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}], \quad (6)$$

where $\chi_0 = (4DJa^D)^{-1} = \rho_0/c_0^2$ is the classical uniform transverse susceptibility. The phase factors $p_+ = -i$ and $p_- = 1$ are introduced for later convenience and $V = a^D N$ is the volume. One easily verifies that $[\hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}, \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}'\sigma'}] = iV \delta_{\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{k}'} \delta_{\sigma, \sigma'}$, so that $\hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ and $\hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ are canonically

conjugate bosonic field operators, with $\hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}/\hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma}$ corresponding to the position/momentum operators. These operators are simply related to the Fourier components of the total spin $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{k}} = N^{-1/2} \sum_i e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_i} \mathbf{S}_i$ and the staggered spin $\mathbf{S}_{\text{st},\mathbf{k}} = N^{-1/2} \sum_i e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_i} \zeta_i \mathbf{S}_i$, where $\zeta_i = 1$ for $\mathbf{r}_i \in A$ and $\zeta_i = -1$ for $\mathbf{r}_i \in B$. For large S we find to leading order

$$S_{\text{st},\mathbf{k}}^x \approx N^{-1/2} (S/a^D) \lambda_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}+}, \quad (7a)$$

$$S_{\text{st},\mathbf{k}}^y \approx N^{-1/2} (S/a^D) \lambda_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}-}, \quad (7b)$$

and

$$S_{\mathbf{k}}^x \approx -N^{-1/2} \lambda_{\mathbf{k}}^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}-}, \quad (8a)$$

$$S_{\mathbf{k}}^y \approx N^{-1/2} \lambda_{\mathbf{k}}^{-1} \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}+}. \quad (8b)$$

Here $\lambda_{\mathbf{k}} = [u_{\mathbf{k}} + v_{\mathbf{k}}](\epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}/2)^{1/2} = [(1 + \gamma_{\mathbf{k}})/2]^{1/2}$ approaches unity for $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow 0$. Hence, our Hermitian field operators can be identified physically with the suitably normalized transverse components of the staggered and total (ferromagnetic) spin for large S . Writing $\hat{\Phi} = (\hat{\Phi}_+, \hat{\Phi}_-)$ and $\hat{\Pi} = (\hat{\Pi}_+, \hat{\Pi}_-)$ and using Eq. (6), we find that $\hat{H}'_2$ takes the form

$$\hat{H}'_2 = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \left[\frac{\hat{\Phi}_{-\mathbf{k}} \cdot \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}}}{2\chi_0} + \frac{\chi_0 E_{\mathbf{k}}^2}{2} \hat{\Pi}_{-\mathbf{k}} \cdot \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}} \right]. \quad (9)$$

The parameterization of the spin fluctuations introduced by Anderson in his early work on the antiferromagnetic ground state [1] differs from our Eq. (6) only in the choice of normalization factors. Subsequently, this method has been far less popular than the approach based on the usual bosonic annihilation and creation operators and has been largely forgotten. Nevertheless, the Hermitian operator approach has many advantages: (a) the suppression of the effective interaction between antiferromagnetic magnons at long wavelengths is manifest; (b) the relation between the Holstein-Primakoff bosons and the continuum fields Π in the NLSM can be made precise; (c) a new effective action for the transverse staggered spin fluctuations can be obtained by eliminating the ferromagnetic fluctuations in a path integral formulation. The resulting interaction vertices differ from those of the NLSM, because the $1/S$ -approach contains scattering processes which are not related to the constant length constraint of the spin vector. At one-loop order it turns out that the two-body interaction does not renormalize the Gaussian part of the effective action, so that the quantum critical point separating the renormalized classical from the quantum disordered phase can be directly related to the anomalous dimension of the Π -field; (d) the Hermitian operator approach is most convenient to discuss spin-waves in finite-size antiferromagnets.

We now explain the above points in some detail, beginning with (d). As first pointed out by Anderson [1], for finite N the $\mathbf{k} = 0$ term in Eq. (9) should be treated with special care. Defining the dimensionless operators $\mathbf{P} = (SN)^{-1/2} \hat{\Phi}_0$ and $\mathbf{X} = (S/N)^{1/2} a^{-D} \hat{\Pi}_0$ whose components satisfy $[X_{\sigma}, P_{\sigma'}] = i\delta_{\sigma,\sigma'}$, and using the fact that for periodic boundary conditions $E_{\mathbf{k}=0} = 0$, the contribution from the $\mathbf{k} = 0$ term to Eq. (9) is $\hat{H}_2^0 = \frac{\mathbf{P}^2}{2m}$ with $m = 4DJ S$. Obviously, the spectrum of $\hat{H}_2^0$ is continuous; the ground state is the zero-momentum state satisfying $\langle \mathbf{P}^2 \rangle = 0$. However, for any state with $\langle \mathbf{X} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{P} \rangle = 0$ we have $\langle \mathbf{P}^2 \rangle \langle \mathbf{X}^2 \rangle \geq 1$ by the uncertainty principle, so that $\langle \mathbf{X}^2 \rangle = \infty$ in the ground state. The staggered magnetization $M_{\text{st}} = \langle \sum_i \zeta_i S_i^z \rangle$ can be written as

$$M_{\text{st}} = N(S + 1/2) - \langle \mathbf{P}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathbf{X}^2 \rangle - \frac{1}{2V} \sum_{\mathbf{k} \neq 0} \langle f_{\mathbf{k}} \hat{\Phi}_{-\mathbf{k}} \cdot \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}} + f_{\mathbf{k}}^{-1} \hat{\Pi}_{-\mathbf{k}} \cdot \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}} \rangle, \quad (10)$$

where $f_{\mathbf{k}} = a^D/(S\lambda_{\mathbf{k}}^2)$. In the ground state of $\hat{H}_2$ the zero mode gives rise to an infinite correction to M_{st} . At first sight, it appears that our approach is inconsistent. The reason why the spin-wave approach can still be useful in finite systems has been discussed by Anderson [1]: suppose we prepare a finite-size antiferromagnet by some external field in a minimal uncertainty wave-packet with $\langle \mathbf{P}^2 \rangle = \langle \mathbf{X}^2 \rangle = 1$. The zero-mode contribution to M_{st} is then of relative order $1/N$, and can be ignored for large N . The validity of the spin-wave approach becomes then a dynamical problem: from quantum mechanics we know that under the time evolution governed by $\hat{H}_2^0 = \frac{\mathbf{P}^2}{2m}$ the width of the Gaussian wave-packet increases as $\langle \mathbf{X}^2 \rangle_t = \langle \mathbf{X}^2 \rangle_0 + \frac{t^2}{m^2} \langle \mathbf{P}^2 \rangle_0$ so that the spin-wave approximation breaks down at time $t \approx \sqrt{N}m = \sqrt{N}/(4DJS)$, which for macroscopic systems exceeds the time scale of experiments.

We now go beyond Ref. [1] and consider interactions between spin-waves. Within the Holstein-Primakoff transformation, the leading interaction correction is given by the following bosonic two-body Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_4 = -\frac{1}{8} \sum_{ij} J_{ij} [4n_i n_j + n_i b_i b_j + b_i n_j b_j + b_i^\dagger b_j^\dagger n_j + b_i^\dagger n_i b_j^\dagger], \quad (11)$$

where $n_i = b_i^\dagger b_i$. It is now straightforward (although quite tedious) to express $\hat{H}_4$ in terms of our Hermitian field operators. Since we shall later use the phase space path integral [13] to eliminate the ferromagnetic fluctuations, we symmetrize $\hat{H}_4$ whenever the vertices involve non-commuting operators [14]. The final result is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_4 = E_4 + \frac{\hat{H}_2'}{2S} + \frac{\rho_0}{2V^3} \frac{D}{a^2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_4} \delta_{\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{k}_3 + \mathbf{k}_4, 0} & \left[\Gamma^{\text{III}}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}_1} \cdot \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}_2} \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}_3} \cdot \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}_4} \right. \\ & + f_0^2 \Gamma_{\parallel}^{\Phi\Pi}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) \sum_{\sigma} \frac{1}{2} \{ \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}_1\sigma} \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}_2\sigma}, \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}_3\sigma} \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}_4\sigma} \} \\ & + f_0^2 \Gamma_{\perp}^{\Phi\Pi}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) \sum_{\sigma} \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}_1\sigma} \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}_2\sigma} \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}_3, -\sigma} \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}_4, -\sigma} \\ & + f_0^2 \Gamma_u^{\Phi\Pi}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) \{ \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}_1+}, \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}_2+} \} \{ \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}_3-}, \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}_4-} \} \\ & \left. + f_0^4 \Gamma^{\Phi\Phi}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}_1} \cdot \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}_2} \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}_3} \cdot \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}_4} \right], \quad (12) \end{aligned}$$

where $\{\hat{A}, \hat{B}\} = \hat{A}\hat{B} + \hat{B}\hat{A}$ denotes the anticommutator, $E_4 = -(DJ/4)[N + \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \gamma_{\mathbf{k}}]$, and $f_0 = f_{\mathbf{k}=0} = a^D/S$. Writing $\gamma_1 = \gamma_{\mathbf{k}_1}$ etc., the properly symmetrized vertices in Eq. (12) are

$$\Gamma^{\text{III}}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) = (1/8) \lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \lambda_4 [\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3 + \gamma_4 - 2(\gamma_{1+2} + \gamma_{3+4})], \quad (13a)$$

$$\Gamma_{\parallel}^{\Phi\Pi}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) = (1/4) (\lambda_1 \lambda_2)^{-1} \lambda_3 \lambda_4 [-\gamma_1 - \gamma_2 + \gamma_3 + \gamma_4 - 2(\gamma_{1+2} + \gamma_{3+4})], \quad (13b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\perp}^{\Phi\Pi}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) = (1/4) (\lambda_1 \lambda_2)^{-1} \lambda_3 \lambda_4 & [3(-\gamma_1 - \gamma_2 + \gamma_3 + \gamma_4) - 2(\gamma_{1+2} + \gamma_{3+4}) \\ & + 4(\gamma_{1+3} + \gamma_{2+4})], \quad (13c) \end{aligned}$$

$$\Gamma_u^{\Phi\Pi}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) = (1/8) \lambda_1^{-1} \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \lambda_4^{-1} [\gamma_1 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3 + \gamma_4 - 4(\gamma_{1+3} + \gamma_{2+4})], \quad (13d)$$

$$\Gamma^{\Phi\Phi}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) = (1/8) (\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3 \lambda_4)^{-1} [-\gamma_1 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3 - \gamma_4 - 2(\gamma_{1+2} + \gamma_{3+4})]. \quad (13e)$$

The important point is now that the vertex Γ^{III} associated with the direct interaction between staggered spin fluctuations vanishes quadratically for small momenta,

$$\Gamma^{\text{III}}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) = (a^2/16D) [\mathbf{k}_1^2 + \mathbf{k}_2^2 + \mathbf{k}_3^2 + \mathbf{k}_4^2 + 4\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}_2 + 4\mathbf{k}_3 \cdot \mathbf{k}_4] + \mathcal{O}(k_i^4), \quad (14)$$

while the other vertices approach finite limits,

$$\Gamma_{\parallel}^{\Phi\Pi}(0) = \Gamma_u^{\Phi\Pi}(0) = \Gamma^{\Phi\Phi}(0) = -1, \text{ and } \Gamma_{\perp}^{\Phi\Pi}(0) = 1. \quad (15)$$

Hence, in our parameterization the bare interaction between the staggered spin fluctuations is manifestly suppressed at long wavelengths, as seen from Eq. (14). General symmetry arguments [8] suggest that this suppression survives when we take into account the renormalization of the staggered spin fluctuations by the ferromagnetic ones. We have explicitly verified this within the Hartree-Fock approximation, where the two-body part in Eq. (12) is replaced by a one-body Hamiltonian. Using $\langle \hat{\Pi}_{-\mathbf{k}\sigma} \hat{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \rangle = V(2\chi_0 E_{\mathbf{k}})^{-1}$, $\langle \hat{\Phi}_{-\mathbf{k}\sigma} \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \rangle = V\chi_0 E_{\mathbf{k}}/2$, and $\langle \hat{\Pi}_{-\mathbf{k}\sigma} \hat{\Phi}_{\mathbf{k}\sigma} \rangle = iV/2$, we find that the Hartree-Fock approximation amounts to the replacement $\hat{H}_4 \rightarrow E'_4 + \frac{C}{2S} \hat{H}'_2$, where E'_4 differs from E_4 given above by a constant of the order of unity, and $C = 1 - (2/N) \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \epsilon_{\mathbf{k}}$. It follows that the leading $1/S$ -correction to the magnon dispersion can be taken into account in the free spin-wave Hamiltonian $\hat{H}'_2$ given in Eq. (9) by replacing $\chi_0 \rightarrow Z_{\chi}\chi_0$ and $E_{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow Z_c E_{\mathbf{k}}$, with the renormalization factors $Z_{\chi} = [1 + \frac{C}{2S}]^{-1}$ and $Z_c = 1 + \frac{C}{2S}$. Note that this simply leads to an overall rescaling of the magnon dispersion, but does not change its wave-vector dependence [15].

In contrast, the vertices encountered in the usual spin-wave theory, based on the magnon operators $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}$ defined in Eq. (4), have a more complicated structure. Using the Dyson-Maleev transformation (the vertices derived from the Holstein-Primakoff transformation are linear combinations of the Dyson-Maleev vertices [5]), the interaction part takes the form [16, 17]

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}_4^{\text{DM}} = \frac{\chi_0^{-1}}{4V} \sum_{\mathbf{k}_1, \dots, \mathbf{k}_4} & \left\{ V_{1234}^{(1)} (\beta_1^{\dagger} \beta_2^{\dagger} \beta_3 \beta_4 + \alpha_3^{\dagger} \alpha_4^{\dagger} \alpha_1 \alpha_2) - 2V_{1234}^{(2)} (\alpha_3^{\dagger} \beta_4 \alpha_1 \alpha_2 + \alpha_4^{\dagger} \beta_1^{\dagger} \beta_2^{\dagger} \beta_3) \right. \\ & + 2V_{1234}^{(3)} (\alpha_3^{\dagger} \alpha_4^{\dagger} \alpha_2 \beta_1^{\dagger} + \alpha_1 \beta_2^{\dagger} \beta_3 \beta_4) - 2V_{1234}^{(4)} (\alpha_3^{\dagger} \alpha_1 \beta_2^{\dagger} \beta_4 + \alpha_4^{\dagger} \alpha_2 \beta_1^{\dagger} \beta_3) \\ & \left. + V_{1234}^{(5)} (\alpha_3^{\dagger} \alpha_4^{\dagger} \beta_1^{\dagger} \beta_2^{\dagger} + \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \beta_3 \beta_4) \right\} \delta_{\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3 + \mathbf{k}_4}. \quad (16) \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity, we have introduced the notation $\alpha_i = \alpha_{\mathbf{k}_i}$ etc. In the limit that all wave vectors are small, the Dyson-Maleev vertices $V_{1234}^{(j)} = V^{(j)}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4)$ behave as [16]

$$V_{1234}^{(j)} \sim \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{|\mathbf{k}_1||\mathbf{k}_2|}{|\mathbf{k}_3||\mathbf{k}_4|}} \left(1 + \xi_j \frac{\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{k}_2}{|\mathbf{k}_1||\mathbf{k}_2|} \right), \quad (17)$$

with $\xi_1 = \xi_2 = \xi_5 = 1$ and $\xi_3 = \xi_4 = -1$. Obviously, these vertices do not vanish for small momenta. Moreover, the long-wavelength limits are direction-dependent and the non-analytic prefactor can potentially give rise to divergences in perturbation theory. Although the weakness of the underlying spin-wave interaction is not apparent, it was shown in [6] that to order $1/S^2$ the divergences cancel in a $1/S$ -expansion as a consequence of total spin conservation [9]. Comparing Eq. (17) to the equivalent Eqs. (14,15) of the Hermitian operator formulation, the much simpler structure of the latter becomes clear. This simpler structure is a direct consequence of using physically transparent operators.

In the conventional approach based on the operators $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}$, it is very cumbersome to calculate higher order terms in a $1/S$ -expansion [5, 6]. Instead of performing a complete $1/S$ -expansion, we shall here only concentrate on the long wavelength antiferromagnetic fluctuations. Within the Hermitian field parameterization these are clearly separated from the ferromagnetic ones. Moreover, the weakness of the interaction between long wavelength staggered fluctuations is explicit in this approach. We thus simply eliminate the ferromagnetic

degrees of freedom represented by the $\hat{\Phi}$ -operators and work directly with the effective action $S_{\text{eff}}[\mathbf{\Pi}]$ of the staggered fluctuations. Formally, $S_{\text{eff}}[\mathbf{\Pi}]$ can be defined as a phase space path-integral [13, 14], $e^{-S_{\text{eff}}[\mathbf{\Pi}]} = \int \mathcal{D}[\Phi] e^{-S[\mathbf{\Pi}, \Phi]}$, where the Euclidean action $S[\mathbf{\Pi}, \Phi]$ is a functional of quantum fields $\mathbf{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}}(\tau)$ and $\Phi_{\mathbf{k}}(\tau)$ associated with the field operators. Within the Gaussian approximation we obtain

$$S[\mathbf{\Pi}, \Phi] \approx \frac{1}{2} \int_K \left[\chi_0^{-1} \Phi_{-K} \cdot \Phi_K + \chi_0 E_{\mathbf{k}}^2 \mathbf{\Pi}_{-K} \cdot \mathbf{\Pi}_K - \omega_n (\Phi_{-K} \cdot \mathbf{\Pi}_K - \mathbf{\Pi}_{-K} \cdot \Phi_K) \right], \quad (18)$$

where $K = (\mathbf{k}, i\omega_n)$ is a collective label for wave-vector and bosonic Matsubara frequency ω_n , the Fourier transformed fields are $\mathbf{\Pi}_K = \int_0^\beta d\tau e^{i\omega_n \tau} \mathbf{\Pi}_{\mathbf{k}}(\tau)$, and $\int_K = (\beta V)^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\omega_n}$. The corresponding Gaussian effective action for the staggered fluctuations is

$$S_{\text{eff}}[\mathbf{\Pi}] \approx \frac{\chi_0}{2} \int_K (E_{\mathbf{k}}^2 + \omega_n^2) \mathbf{\Pi}_{-K} \cdot \mathbf{\Pi}_K. \quad (19)$$

In the long-wavelength limit $E_{\mathbf{k}} \approx c_0 |\mathbf{k}|$, so that Eq. (19) has precisely the same form as the Gaussian approximation of the NLSM in Eq. (3). Because we have explicitly constructed the $\mathbf{\Pi}$ -field in Eq. (19) from the Holstein-Primakoff bosons b_i , we have succeeded to give a mathematically precise relation between the two different parameterization of the spin fluctuations.

The leading interaction correction to $S_{\text{eff}}[\mathbf{\Pi}]$ is due to the vertex Γ^{III} in Eq. (12) involving four $\hat{\mathbf{\Pi}}$ -operators. Retaining only this term we obtain in the long-wavelength limit with the help of Eq. (14) at $T = 0$,

$$S_{\text{eff}}[\mathbf{\Pi}] \approx \frac{1}{2g_0} \int dx_0 \int d^D x \left\{ (\partial_\mu \mathbf{\Pi})^2 + (\partial_0 \mathbf{\Pi})^2 + \frac{1}{4} [2 (\mathbf{\Pi} \cdot \partial_\mu \mathbf{\Pi})^2 - \mathbf{\Pi}^2 (\partial_\mu \mathbf{\Pi})^2] \right\}, \quad (20)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = \Lambda_0 \mathbf{r}$ and $x_0 = \Lambda_0 c_0 \tau$ are dimensionless space-time variables, $g_0 = \Lambda_0^{D-1} c_0 / \rho_0$ is the usual [11] dimensionless coupling constant of the NLSM, and $\Lambda_0 \approx 1/a$ is an ultraviolet cutoff. The quartic interaction in Eq. (20) does *not* agree with the quartic term in the perturbative expansion of the action (3) of the NLSM [11]. In the latter case, the term in the square braces of Eq. (20) is replaced by $4(\mathbf{\Pi} \cdot \partial_\mu \mathbf{\Pi})^2$ and there is an additional counter-term due to the expansion of the functional δ -function enforcing the constraint $\mathbf{\Omega}^2 = 1$. The reason for this difference is that in the NLSM all interactions arise from the non-linear constraint $\mathbf{\Omega}^2 = 1$. In contrast, the $1/S$ -approach contains dynamic interactions neglected in the NLSM, but ignores the constraints associated with the finiteness of the spin Hilbert space which according to Dyson [4] amount to irrelevant kinematic interactions.

It turns out that within a one-loop momentum shell renormalization group (RG) approach [10, 11] the quartic interaction in Eq. (20) does not renormalize the Gaussian part (19) of our effective action at all. A similar cancellation is known to happen also in the corresponding ferromagnetic Heisenberg model [10]. If we apply the usual momentum scale RG procedure consisting of mode elimination and rescaling [10, 11], then the dependence of the running coupling g_l on the logarithmic RG flow parameter l is at one loop entirely due to the rescaling step. The resulting one-loop RG flow equation is simply

$$\partial_l g_l = -(D - 1 - \eta_l^\pi) g_l. \quad (21)$$

Here η_l^π is the running anomalous dimension of the $\mathbf{\Pi}$ -field (not to be confused with the usual critical exponent η), which is related to the interaction-dependent part of the field rescaling factor $Z_l^{1/2}$ as usual, $\eta_l^\pi = -\partial_l \ln Z_l$. The simplest way to calculate η_l^π is from the

transformation properties of the staggered magnetization M_{st} given in Eq. (10) under the momentum scale RG [10]. By demanding that the scaling of the fluctuation correction in Eq. (10) is consistent with the leading term $N(S + 1/2)$ (which scales as the volume), it is easy to show that $\eta_l^\pi = \frac{K_D}{2} g_l$, where K_D is the surface of the unit sphere in D dimensions divided by $(2\pi)^D$. The resulting RG equation for g_l ,

$$\partial_l g_l = (1 - D)g_l + \frac{1}{2} K_D g_l^2, \quad (22)$$

is of course identical to the equation derived in Ref. [11]. Interestingly, in our formulation the quantum critical point separating the renormalized classical from the quantum disordered regime can be characterized by $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} \eta_l^\pi = D - 1$.

In summary, we have developed a new parameterization of the spin-wave expansion which is clearly superior to the conventional formulation based on the magnon operators $\alpha_{\mathbf{k}}$ and $\beta_{\mathbf{k}}$ in Eq. (4). In our parameterization the physical meaning of the degrees of freedom is transparent, the weak interaction between long-wavelength staggered magnons is manifest, the subtleties of the spin-wave approach in finite-size systems can be easily discussed, and the effective theory for the staggered fluctuations can be derived. With our method it is also straightforward to discuss the effect of interactions between the zero modes on the finite-size spin-wave spectrum, and to study spin-wave interactions in more complicated models involving various anisotropies or external magnetic fields [18].

* * *

We thank Florian Schütz und Ivan Spremo for useful discussions and appreciate financial support by the DFG.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **86**, 694 (1952).
- [2] R. Kubo, Phys. Rev. **87**, 568 (1952).
- [3] T. Holstein and H. Primakoff, Phys. Rev. **58**, 1098 (1940).
- [4] F. J. Dyson, Phys. Rev. **102**, 1217 and 1230 (1956); S. V. Maleev, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **30**, 1010 (1957) [Sov. Phys. JETP **64**, 654 (1958)].
- [5] A. B. Harris, D. Kumar, B. I. Halperin, and P. C. Hohenberg, Phys. Rev. B **3**, 961 (1971).
- [6] P. Kopietz, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 9228 (1990).
- [7] J. I. Igarashi, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 10763 (1992); J. I. Igarashi and T. Nagao, *ibid* **72**, 14403 (2005).
- [8] C. P. Hofmann, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 388 (1999).
- [9] S. V. Maleev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3281 (2000).
- [10] P. Kopietz and S. Chakravarty, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 4858 (1989).
- [11] S. Chakravarty, B. I. Halperin, and D. Nelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1057 (1988); Phys. Rev. B **39**, 2344 (1989).
- [12] V. I. Belinicher and J. da Providência, Annals of Physics **298**, 186 (2002).
- [13] L. S. Schulman, *Techniques and Applications of Path Integration*, (Wiley, New York, 1981).
- [14] T. Gollisch and C. Wetterich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1 (2001).
- [15] T. Oguchi, Phys. Rev. **117**, 117 (1960); S. R. Chinn, R. W. Davies, and H. J. Zeiger, Phys. Rev. B **4**, 4017 (1971).
- [16] P. Kopietz and S. Chakravarty, Phys. Rev. B **56**, 3338 (1997).
- [17] G. Castilla and S. Chakravarty, Phys. Rev. B **43**, 13687 (1991).
- [18] N. Hasselmann, F. Schütz, I. Spremo, and P. Kopietz, cond-mat/0511706.